UNCLASSIFIED

27 March 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

STATINTLFROM.

SUBJECT: Alternatives, Inadequacies and Recommendations, The Relationship

1. One of the problems we now face involves the "marriage" of sections of the report dealing with current ADP-T Network inadequacies, descriptions of alternatives (scenarios) and the recommendations for improvements. I begin by concluding that all of the alternatives, including especially the PM's submission, have attributes and describe plans which advance and extend the concept of community-wide Imagery ADP-T support. Still our various alternatives have a differing service focus when examined in light of the 21 network inadequacies. This writer attempts below to generally rate an alternative in three degrees of improvement in comparison with an inadequacy description. I acknowledge that there is imprecise scenario descriptive language to make perfect and consistent placement. I call these degrees of improvement substantial, moderate and limited. When the alternative description is clear, the solution wide-spread and the user's served broad, I call it substantial (SI). Something less than this, which perhaps must even be inferred, I call moderate (MI). And where, I can't find a string but only an expectation, I call it limited (LI).

2. Here goes:

    a) ALT 1 (PM Plans, upgrades)
       SI: none
       MI: 1,2,3,4,5,7,13,15,16,18,20
       LI: 6,8,9,10,11,12,14,17,19,21

    b) ALT 2 (Strong centralization focus, except PI)
       SI: 1,2,3,5,8,11,14
       MI: 4,7,9,10,15,16,18,20
       LI: 6,12,13,17,19,21

SUBJECT: Alternatives, Inadequacies and Recommendations, The
Relationship

    c) ALT 3 (Strong centralized PI focus)
       SI: 1,9,10,12,16,19,20
       MI: 2,3,4,5,7,11,14,15,17,18,21
       LI: 6,8,13

    d) ALT 4 (Strong centralized focus, except NDS)
       SI: 1,2,3,5,14
       MI: 4,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,18,20
       LI: 6,16,17,19,21

    e) ALT 5 (CM System, AS System, PI System, Common)
       SI: 1,2,5,10,11,14
       MI: 3,4,6,7,9,12,15,16,17,18,19,20
       LI: 8,13,21

    f) ALT 6 (Interactive National tasking, AS System,
           decentralized PI support)
       SI: 1,2,5,7,11,14
       MI: 3,4,6,13,15,16,18,19,20,21
       LI: 8,9,10,12,17

    g) ALT 7 (Centralized Develop, Support all functions)
       SI: 4,8,13,15,16,17,19,20,21
       MI: 1,2,3,5,6,12,14,18
       LI: 7,9,10,11

    3. OK, so what? Answer, I'm not sure. Perhaps the alternative
descriptions are weak; perhaps the inadequacies are inappropriate;
perhaps, an alternative which describes Dave's recommendations will make
them all SI and MI. Unfortunately, I believe I could write an
alternative description on any of the alternatives which could result in
a SI, MI rating of the alternative in comparison with the inadequacies.
But this description would require policy determination and probably
smack to much of system design. Maybe after all is said and done we
still have the old bug-a-boo of the ADP centralization vs.
decentralization issue, or four basic contraints which seem to govern
all ADP decisions. These are:

    a) Organizational Mission
    b) Management Authority
    c) Development Risk
    d) Cost.

SUBJECT: Alternatives, Inadequacies and Recommendations, The
          Relationship

It beats me why we have different uniforms for the Army and the Air
Force, especially since at one time they were one. But we do. Still,
there is some standardization and interoperability. The underware is
likely the same and a size 40 long in either uniform should fit the same
man. I know, a bad example in comparison with the Imagery ADP-T
problem, right? Wrong. The issues are similar and so are the
alternatives.

The same question persists. How much authority do you give management
to develop a system to support their mission within what risks and at
what cost? A management centralist would give an entirely different
answer than a management decentralist, as would centralized vs.
decentralized ADP proponents. I think, however, there is a middle
ground. I'll answer the above question this way. You give as much
authority to management to develop a system to support their mission as
the cost permits. You thus minimize risk and complexity, but usually at
higher costs.

     4. But to tie this philosophical discussion back to the real world
of alternatives and ADP-T network inadequacies; it looks to me like
alternative 3, 5, and 7 are winners. However, 7 has very high risks and
3 and 5 have substantial risks. Note though how the downsized IDHS-80
recommendation for the U&S Commands decreases the risks and complexity
of CPIS yet with most of the attractive (politically and technically)
benefits. This is only one reason why I believe we can concensus around
a "DASITT prefered alternative", the new one we'll write around Dave's
recommendations. And the beauty of the recommendations is that most are
so consistent with the existing PM plans, mission and responsibility as
to blur the distinction between something dramatically new and the
extension/enhancement of something existing. Oh, there's a few new
wrinkles, but these are not (except perhaps CAMS rev-by-rev interactive
tasking) the kinds of things senior managers fall on their swords about.

     5. I suggest we get a lot more "atta-boys" if we call the
alternative description supporting most of Dave's recommendations: Alt
1-add required funds to PM plans. I'm not being smart and I mean most.

SUBJECT: Alternatives, Inadequacies and Recommendations, The
           Relationship

Some of Dave's recommendations are very complex senior management issues
which are substantially alternative independent anyway.

STATINTL

STATINTL

Distribution:
     Original:
       Copy 2:
          3:
          4:
          5:
          6:
          7: File